AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111   Page 2
Serial Number: 09/896,206   Dkt: P11235
Filing Date: June 29, 2001
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR EFFICIENT DISPATCH OF INTERFACE CALLS

IN THE DRAWINGS

Corrected drawings are supplied herewith. In particular, "Fig. 3" has been replaced with "Fig. 3A".

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed August 29, 2008. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 17-22 remain pending of which claims 21-22 are new.

Drawing Objection

In response to the objections raised by the Office, Applicant has replaced all occurrences of "Fig. 3" with "Fig. 3A" in the specification and figures (see, for example, replacement sheet corresponding to Figs. 3A and 3B submitted on the same day via EFS). Accordingly, this objection is believed to be moot.

35 USC § 101 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as were indicated to be directed to non statutory subject matter. It is believed that the above-detailed amendments fully address these rejections. More specifically, claim 17 in part recites "memory to store data corresponding to the first interface D" which clearly renders claim 17 (and its dependent claims 18-20) statutory.

35 USC §§102 and 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 17, 18, and 20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leach (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,764) in view of Corbett (U.S. Patent No. 5,515,536).

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Leach (U.S. Patent No.5,745,764) in view of Corbett (U.S. Patent No. 5,515,536) and further in view of Hasha (U.S. Patent No. 7353271). However, the language of the outstanding Office Action supporting this rejection appears to rely on obviousness under 35 USC §103 at least because the Office combines three different references. Accordingly, it is believed that this is a typo and claim 19 is in fact rejected under 35 USC §103.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed since the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of features such as set forth in any of the pending claims.

Without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, only in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to in part recite "wherein, at compile time, a compiler is to generate the first interface vtable G.D and the second interface vtable G.E that indicate an index for each function to be determined based a definition of class G."

It is respectfully submitted that the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach (or even suggest) the claimed combination of features such as set forth in claim 1, including for example, that a compiler is to generate the vtables at compile time to indicate an index for each function to be determined or that the generating is based on a definition of class G.

More particularly, the Office is equating Leach's "virtual function table". However, Leach fails to indicate that its virtual function tables are generated by a compiler at compile time. Also, Leach fails to indicate that the its virtual function tables are generated based on a definition of class G. In fact, Leach teaches the exact opposite by repeatedly reciting in various forms that "a client can instantiate an object of class S1 without having access to the S1 class definition at compile time or run time." (see, e.g., Leach at col. 14, lines 43-45). Further, the remaining cited art fail to cure Leach's short-coming. Even if the Office elects to rely on combination of Leach with the other cited references, it is respectfully submitted that such combination would render an inoperable solution as Leach's main goal (as stated above) would be contrary to such a combination.

According, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

For example, new claims 21 and 22 further distinguish the cited art by indicating differing relationships between the fourth and fifth pointers.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111   Page 8
Serial Number: 09/896.206   Dkt: P11235
Filing Date: June 29, 2001
Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR EFFICIENT DISPATCH OF INTERFACE CALLS

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (303.800.6678) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

However, no extension of time fee is believed to be due since the three-month date of the Action was a Saturday.

Respectfully submitted,

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890

Telephone Number: 303.800.6678

Date____Dec. 1, 2008_____   By ____/Ramin Aghevli/_____
                                             Ramin Aghevli
                                             Reg. No. 43,462